

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7, 9-11, 13-19, and 27-31 are currently pending. Claims 7, 11, 27, and 33 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 8, 12, 20-26, 32, and 34-37 have been canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added. Claim 7 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 26, and claim 11 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 32.

Claims 34-35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Ryzin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,255,961.

Claims 7, 9-10, 11, and 13-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Ryzin et al. in view of Guo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,173,330 and further in view of Allport, U.S. Patent No. 6,104,334.

Applicants respectfully submit that Van Ryzin, either alone or in combination with Guo and Allport, fails to show or suggest a remote control configured to issue “an audible warning for an upcoming presentation of a media presentation associated with the media record,” as recited in amended claim 7.

Van Ryzin, as understood, discusses a media guide that may be displayed on a remote control. See Van Ryzin at Col. 5, lines 51-55. The media guide may be received from an electronic device, such as a CD player. See Van Ryzin at Col. 4, lines 18 – 30. While Van Ryzin discusses the display of a media guide on a display of the remote control, Van Ryzin fails entirely to show or suggest a remote control that is configured to emit an audible warning to warn a user of the remote control of the upcoming presentations of a media record as required by claim 7. Therefore, Van Ryzin fails to render amended claim 7 obvious.

Guo fails to make up the deficiencies of Van Ryzin. Guo, as understood, discusses a system for transferring media guide information to a television set and displaying a media guide on the television set (not on a remote control) based on the media guide information. See Guo at Col. 1, lines 5-13. Guo fails entirely to show or suggest a remote control that is configured to emit an audible warning to warn a user of the remote control of the upcoming presentations of a media record as required by claim 7. Therefore, Guo fails to make up for the deficiencies of Van Ryzin. Therefore, Van Ryzin and Guo fail to render amended claim 7 obvious.

Allport fails to make up for the deficiencies of Van Ryzin and Guo. Allport, as understood, discusses a remote control that configures itself to a particular user using the remote control. See, for example, claim 1 of Allport. Allport fails entirely, however, to show or suggest a remote control that is configured to emit an audible warning to warn a user of the remote control of the upcoming presentations of a media record as required by claim 7. Therefore, Allport fails to make up for the deficiencies of Van Ryzin and Guo. Therefore, Van Ryzin, Guo, and Allport fail to render amended claim 7 obvious.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite similar limitation to those limitations of amended claim 7 distinguished from Van Ryzin, Guo, and Allport above. Therefore, for at least the same reasons that Van Ryzin, Guo, and Allport fail to render amended claim 7 obvious, Van Ryzin, Guo, and Allport similarly fail to render amended claim 11 obvious.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Rodney C. LeRoy
Reg. No. 53,205

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RCL:cmm
60790195 v1